

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

#### **A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT**

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Amend independent claims 1 and 11.
2. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

#### **B. THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite the act of/means for generating a unique Application User Identification (AUID) random code which is assigned to a combination of the mobile user and the service application when the mobile user has not previously accessed the service application. The underlined and added phraseology is supported by the original disclosure, such as (for example page 13, lines 4+).

As amended, independent claims 1 and 11 further recite the act of/means for the service application using the assigned AUID code to obtain the user data in conjunction with any subsequent service request from the mobile station. This new last paragraph of independent claim 1 is supported, e.g., by page 14, lines 4+ of the original specification.

#### **C. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-2, 5, 10-12, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al in view of U.S. Publication 2001/0041593 to Asada. Claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al in view of Publication 2001/0041593 to Asada and further in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0115201 to Krishnamoorthy. Claims 6-8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al in view of Publication 2001/0041593 to Asada and further in view of EP 1081916 to King. Claims 9-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al in view of Publication 2001/0041593 to Asada and further in view of U.S.

Publication 2003/0016823 to Chung. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Lammi service provider then sends a location request, in effect a request for user data, to a location register, including the anonymous identifier. The location register "finds out" the corresponding user identifier from the encrypting device and makes a location query to the mobile network for the retrieved user identifier. The location register then returns geographical information to the service provider. Lammi thus involves at least three network nodes: the service gateway, the encrypting device, and the location register.

There are numerous important differences between Applicant's independent claims and WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al. For example, the technique described in WO 01/28273 to Lammi et al is directed to solve the problem of protecting the user identifier from a service provider in a service request from the user addressed to that service provider. The solution is to modify the service request by substituting the user identifier with an anonymous identifier, obtained by encryption, in order to conceal the user's true identity (i.e., not expose the user identifier) to the service provider. The service provider can then still obtain geographical information from the mobile network by referring to the received anonymous identifier, which the network can recognize as corresponding to the true user identifier.

Applicant, on the other hand, solves a problem of authorizing the service application of the external service provider to receive requested user data, which is an altogether different matter. In other words, Applicant protects the user data from unauthorized service providers, in contrast to Lammi where the user identifier is protected from the service provider even if the service provider is allowed to receive the requested geographical information.

Applicant's solution thus involves assigning an AUID code to a combination of the mobile user and the service application, and sending the AUID code together with the user's

request to the service application. Thus, it is not necessary for Applicant to modify the user's request by substituting an encryption of a user identifier therein, in contrast to Lammi. Applicant's service application is authorised to receive user data by including the AUID code in a user data request.

Thus, since the AUID code is associated with the specific service application, Applicant's specific service application can be authorized to receive user data by including the AUID code in its user data request.

There is an important distinction between the phrase "service application" (as employed in Applicant's claimed assigning of an AUID code to a combination of the mobile user and the service application) and the phrase "service request" (such as the service-request-specific anonymous identifier mentioned in Lammi). This difference is now emphasized by the amended independent claims. For Applicant's independent claims, the AUID code is only generated when the mobile user accesses the service application for the first time (see page 13, line 5; and page 8, line 25). On the other hand, the service-request-specific anonymous identifier mentioned in Lammi must obviously be generated for each service request in order for the anonymous identifier to be service-request-specific.

Thus, for Applicant, the service application can redfer to the initially received AUID code to obtain user data from the mobile network for any subsequent requests. Moreover, Applicant's same AUID code can be submittted from a data control server to the service application upon subsequent requests, so that the service can retrifve and use eraier obtained and stored user data by means of the same AUID code instead of having to request it again from the network. *See, e.g.,* page 9, line 29 through page 10, lines 6 and the example of Fig. 4 in Applicant's specification. Thus, Applicant's independent claims provide functionality not possible in Lammi.

Others of Applicant's claims have separate patentable merit, such as (for example) dependent claim 6 (which specifies an act of checking a permission table specifying types of user data that each service application is allowed to receive from the mobile network).

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the prior art rejections be withdrawn and the application passed to issue.

### C. MISCELLANEOUS

A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.  
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsb  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100